



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

|                      |   |                           |               |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Applicant</b>     | Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District | <b>County</b>             | Yolo          |
| <b>Project Title</b> | Real-time Groundwater Level Monitoring Network            | <b>Grant Request</b>      | \$ 239,650.00 |
|                      |   | <b>Total Project Cost</b> | \$ 271,650.00 |

**Project Description:** The Proposal develops a regional understanding of real-time groundwater interactions by installing 10 monitoring stations on existing wells and shares this data directly with the public on a groundwater index website.

### Evaluation Summary:

| Scoring Criterion                          | Score     |
|--|-----------|
| GWMP or Program                            | 5         |
| Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed | 5         |
| Work Plan                                  | 6         |
| Budget                                     | 3         |
| Schedule                                   | 5         |
| QA/QC                                      | 5         |
| Past Performance                           | 4         |
| Geographical Balance                       | 0         |
| <b>Total Score</b>                         | <b>33</b> |

- **GWMP or Program:** The Applicant's GWMP was formally adopted on June 6, 2006. The adoption notice (Ordinance No. 1-2006) was supplied on page 59 of the application in Attachment 3.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant indicates how they plan to accomplish three well-detailed primary tasks to establish a regional real-time groundwater level monitoring network. The proposal includes goals and objectives, a description of the needed facilities, and a map showing proposed sensor installation locations. The proposal demonstrates collaboration among the Yolo County FCWCD, WRA, NCW and various other local public agencies with regard to the management of the groundwater basin, and adequately demonstrates that the information gained from the sensors will be helpful in evaluating real-time data from moment of implementation. The proposal sufficiently demonstrates that the groundwater monitoring network will achieve six specific objectives of the GWMP. Finally, the proposal effectively explains how the ongoing use of the products will be funded by Yolo County FCWCD and WRA once the proposed grant funding is expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Applicant's Work Plan provides tasks with short descriptions, but many subtasks (especially for subtasks in Tasks 2 and 3) are sparsely described or merely listed and lack sufficient detail to fully understand what work is involved with each subtask or how it will be accomplished. For example, with respect to "Review and refinement of site selection criteria," (first bullet (subtask) of Task 1) it is not entirely clear how this will be done or what it entails. There is no description to evaluate the approach or the criteria that will be used to select a site. The next bullet, "Evaluate and prepare budgets..." should not be prospective and should be fully developed in the proposal Budget section. Although the proposal is consistent with the Budget and Schedule, it does not present a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project. The WP does not possess a task for project grant administration, including deliverables of required progress reports or invoice packages. The Work Plan does not provide sufficient enough assurances that the specific locations of the monitoring equipment will be granted private property access beyond describing that "in general," landowners participate in such programs. The Applicant adequately describes how information will be disseminated to the public (Task 2 - bullet 5, Task 3 – bullet 1), and adequately explains that CEQA will be addressed with a CEQA Categorical Exemption for the monitoring project.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Budget does not include adequate detail, nor sufficient documentation, to discern whether the cost assumptions are realistic. For instance, the Budget does not include how the costs were estimated, i.e., the specific personnel and their associated hourly rates, direct costs, and consultant costs. In addition, the Budget describes that the cost (\$40,180) for the publicly accessible website was based on the submission of a draft contract, but that information was not submitted as supporting information. Although the Budget is consistent with the Schedule, there is a slight inconsistency with the Work Plan and Budget, for instance, the last work item under Task 1 is not included in the Budget. The Applicant does not provide a breakdown of the in-kind funding sources but did generally identify which tasks they pertain to.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Schedule includes timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed and agrees with the sequencing of the Work Plan and Budget. Given that the Applicant has experience installing automated well monitoring equipment, it presents appropriate detailed tasks defining how the Schedule was derived. The start and end dates are within a 2-year time frame, and the Applicant provides affirmation that they will be ready to proceed when funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The Applicant lists specific personnel that will be performing and overseeing the work and lists their respective professional registrations, certifications, and experience qualifications. Data interpretation, reporting, and project management will be performed under the direct supervision of trained and experienced personnel. The Applicant indicates that standardized procedures will be used whenever possible to ensure consistent data quality and compatibility with other projects in the region. The Applicant identifies that monitoring equipment will be calibrated prior to each testing event and recalibrated when sensor readings begin to wander (page 82), and that hydrographs of manual water level measurements will be reviewed and outliers will be re-measured or corrected.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant states that for a current LGA grant that "past performance on this grant was within all contractual requirements...." As supporting information, the Applicant offers a DOF interim audit report, which covers the period June 20, 2008, through September 30, 2010. Although the results from the audit report appear favorable, it does not represent an audit on a completed project, and though it provides evidence that the Applicant can manage funds, an audit report does not bear fully on the question of whether the project scope was successfully implemented on schedule and under-budget.